DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 624 RC 015 710

AUTHOR Medved, Richard Michael; And Others
TITLE Needs Assessment and Implementation of Staff Development Programs in Rural Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Council on Rural Special Education (Tucson, AZ, April 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Awareness; *Disabilities; Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; Interpersonal Competence; *Mainstreaming; *Needs Assessment; Program Development; Program Implementation; Questionnaires; Rural Education; *Rural Schools; *Staff Development; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Improvement; Time Management; Values Clarification

ABSTRACT

A needs assessment instrument was developed to aid rural (upstate New York) school officials in implementing staff development programs and determining special staff development needs for serving handicapped students in the mainstream. Survey responses were gathered from 85 elementary and secondary teachers in 3 school districts over 2 counties. The survey contained demographic questions--age, teaching experience, ethnic background, sex--and specific questions in topic areas: school support for developing student understanding of values and interpersonal skills; school support for students' skills acquisition; teachers' perceptions of their ability to support student skill acquisition and to work with mainstreamed handicapped children; ability of school to prepare students for post-school life; and teachers' perceptions of district support for their professional development. Results indicated: (1) need to emphasize understanding of students' own values and to improve understanding and sensitivity toward others; (2) insufficient preparation of students to assume jobs in urban/suburban settings and a pluralistic society; (3) student need to acquire career awareness and time management skills; (4) need for administrators to improve organizational climate, to communicate with teachers, and to provide adequate feedback; and (5) need for productive staff development programs that are collaborative and based on needs assessment. Tables of survey results and the needs assessment form are included. (LFL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280624

NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN RURAL SCHOOLS

Richard Michael Medved, Ed.D.
Ann Beth Sarachan-Deily, Ph.D.
James P. Burns, Ph.D.
Philip Lyon, Ph.D.
Pauline Grippin, Ph.D.
Albany, New York

A Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES) in Tucson, Arizona, April, 1986.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Beth Sarachan-Deily

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC015710

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN RURAL SCHOOLS

The purpose of the project, supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (G008301642), is to help rural Chief School Officers (CSOs) to implement staff development programs addressing the problems encountered in meeting the educational needs of student with handicapping conditions in the mainstream. As part of their participation in this three year project several CSOs indicated an interest in conducting a staff development needs assessment to develop a comprehensive five year staff development plan.

The focus of this research is to (1) examine needs assessment and staff development programs in rural settings, (2) to design a needs assessment instrument to be used in participating districts, (3) to use the results of needs assessment to assist CSOs to plan staff development programs, (4) to determine the relationship between staff development needs in serving handicapped children and other staff development needs.

Currently, the Staff Development Needs Assessment instrument has been administered to more than 200 educators in three counties across upstate New York. This paper addresses responses obtained from 85 respondents in three school districts across two counties. Analyses of the data have been incorporated into the five year staff development plans of of two school districts. In one school district, a staff development program has already been presented based, in part, on the results of data obtained from this needs assessment process.

NEED FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL SCHOOLS

The inability of small rural school districts to attract and retain educators has become a problem of national significance (Helge and Marrs, 1982).

Contributing to this problem are a number of factors, including the demand on teachers to be generalists, the need to teach in areas in which one is not trained, low budgets, low salaries, perceived social and cultural isolation, and the lack of inservice training and opportunities for professional development (Helge, 1984; Guenther and Weible, 1983; and Meier and Edington, 1983). According to Marrs (1968) data from the National Rural Project indicated that unsuccessful and or disssatisfied teachers found themselves to be "bored," and not intellectually stimulated.

Attracting competent new teachers to often isolated rural communities is the responsibility of the school administrator in exercising the leadership role. Retaining these teachers is again the responsibility of the school adminstrator in exercising the management role. Key to the retention of competent teachers and school personnel is the need for school administrators to support staff development efforts. The results of a 1979 NRP study indicated that in 94% of the states surveyed inadequate staff development programs were linked to staff retention problems (Helge, 1981).

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN RURAL SCHOOLS

Successful staff development programs are those based upon comprehensive and systematic planning strategies (Crealock, 1982; Helge, 1981; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Joyce, 1976; and Lawrence, 1974). Comprehensive research efforts conducted under the National Rural Project have identified the need to base the development of inservice training programs on needs assessment and collaborative planning. In models presented by Crealock (1982) and Helge (1981) the key to successful staff development programs is the identification of training needs and the delivery of training to staff at the local district level. Too often, districts rely on the consultant model which seeks to bring in outside expertise to provide a package for staff development. The outside

consultant conducts a needs assessment, instructs the district as to their staff development needs, and delivers the training to teachers and staff. Helge recommends having the administrative or management team initiate the staff development process in conjunction with district-wide or building level teams. Schmidt (1983) suggests that local staff are in the best position to identify their staff development needs. Research on smaller rural schools has suggested that local districts exercise more autonomy in the development and delivery of in-service education and staff development programs. Nowak et al. (1982); Cruickshank et al (1979); and Smith and Siantz (1979) advocate the training of educators at the local level to, not only design and develop in-service, but to deliver training programs to colleagues within the local education agencies. Others like Browder (1973); and Skrtic et al (1979) suggest using a collaborative approach to staff development. Local school districts can work in conjunction with colleges and universities, other local educational agencies and state education agencies in the planning and delivery of staff development programs.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In attempting to meet one of the objectives of the project which was to provide technical assistance to CSOs and their administrative teams, the project staff met with two CSOs, who expressed an interest in developing comprehensive five year staff development plans. Incorporating the findings from the research literature on staff development, particularly as applied to rural districts, we agreed to use a collaborative approach. Each participating school district already had in existence a curriculum development committee responsible for advising the CSO on staff development needs and programs. Using input from the administrative teams and the curriculum development committees the project staff developed a needs assessment survey instrument which was reviewed and modified

by the respective schools' staff. The draft instrument was modified based upon the recommendations of staff and then adminstered to the staff in both school districts. The tabulated results (see tables 3 and 4) were presented separately to the adminstrative teams and the curriculum development committees in the respective districts. The data was interpreted by the project staff and consultants to the districts' staff. They, in turn, meshed the data with their own data to develop comprehensive five year staff development plans. The written plans involved the input from the college consultants, the administrative teams, the curriculum development committees and local staff from each of the buildings within the two districts. The approach was consistent with the W-6 Model of Needs Assessment for Inservice Training (Crealock, 1982); Guidelines for Inservice Planning (Browder, 1982); and models generated by Helge (1981).

The specific needs assessment instrument developed by the project staff (see Appendix A) is based upon a discrepancy model of needs assessment which was developed by the staff at Western Washington University, Bellingham in 1978. The specific items within the instrument incorporated findings from the research literature on rural education and rural staff development and the recommendations of participating school district administration and staff. The Staff Development Needs Assessment instrument contains six areas, including school support for the development of student understanding of values and interpersonal skills; school support for student acquisition of specific skills; perceptions of teachers to support the acquisition of specific student skills; teachers ability to work with and support handicapped children in the mainstream; ability of the school district to prepare students for post-school life; and teachers perceptions of district administration to support their professional development. Each of the six areas contains varying numbers of specific items. The instrument also contains a set of demographic questions.

TABLE 3

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT (Results)

	(1) CURRENT (DOES)		(2) FUTURE (SHOULD)		
I	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	26%	74%	5%	95%	X
M/H	69%	31%	12%	88%	X
II	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	33%	67%	11%	89%	X
M/H	47%	53%	10%	90%	X
III	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) LESS	(D) RIGHT	(E) MORE
El.	8%	92%	0%	60%	40%
M/H	9%	91%	2%	68%	30%
IV	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) LESS	(D) RIGHT	(E) MORE
El.	14%	86%	0%	79%	21%
M/H	22%	78%	2%	77%	21%
V	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	24%	76%	4%	96%	X
M/H	41%	59%	19%	81%	X
VI	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	9%	91%	0%	100%	X
M/H	48%	52%	1%	99%	X

E

TABLE 4

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT (Results)

	(1) CURRENT (DOES)		(2) FUTURE (SHOULD)		
I	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	67%	33%	15%	85%	X
M/H	64%	36%	8%	92%	X
II	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	52%	48%	4%	96%	X
M/H	49%	51%	14%	86%	X
III	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) LESS	(D) RIGHT	(E) MORE
El.	12%	88%	.6%	61%	38%
M/H	21%	79%	0%	55%	45%
IV	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) LESS	(D) RIGHT	(E) MORE
El.	5%	95%	0%	44%	56%
M/H	34%	66%	0%	47%	53%
V	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	37%	63%	4%	96%	X
M/H	36%	64%	9%	91%	X
VI	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE	(D) POSITIVE	(E)
El.	17%	83%	7%	93%	X
M/H	29%	71%	4%	96%	X

E

RESULTS

An analysis of the demographic data indicates that out of a sample N=85, 34 respondents were elementary teachers, 46 were middle and high school teachers and 5 were identified as other, which could include special education, librarian, industrial arts, etc. Some special education teachers and special subject teachers identifed themselves as elementary teachers or secondary teachers. This made it impossible to identify separately their responses.

Of the elementary teachers 24% were male, 74% were female and 2% did not identify their sex. Of the secondary teachers 52% were male, 46% were female and 2% did not identify their sex. Thirty-nine percent of the total sample was male and 59% was female.

With respect to the question which asked the number of years teaching 21% of the elementary teachers taught 1-5 years, 15% taught 6-10 years, 21% taught 11-15 years, 26% taught 16-20 years and 18% taught 21+ years. Sixty percent of the elementary teachers taught 11 or more years. Eleven percent of the secondary teachers taught 1-5 years, 28% taught 6-10 years, 20% taught 11-15 years, 20% taught 16-20 years and 22% taught 21+ years. Sixty-two percent of the secondary teachers taught 11 or more years. Of the total sample 16% taught 1-5 years, 24% taught 6-10 years, 20% taught 11-15 years, 21% taught 16-20 years and 19% taught 21+ years. Sixty percent of the total sample taught 11 or more years. The findings suggest that rural educators in this region tend to have more teaching experience as evidenced by the number of years in the teaching field. It would also appear that less experienced teachers, those with five or less years of teaching experience, are found at the elementary level as compared to the secondary level (21% vs. 11%).

Regarding age of the respondents, 5% of elementary teachers are between 20-30 years, 14% are between 31-40 years, 11% are between 41-50 years, 4% are

between 51-60 years and 0% are above age 60. Six perecent of secondary teachers are between 20-30 years, 17% are between 31-40 years, 15% are between 41-50 years, 6% are between 51-60 years and 0% are above age 60. There do not appear to be any differences across age ranges between elementary and secondary teachers. Seventy-three percent of all of the respondents are between 31-50 years of age with an almost equal percentage 14% vs. 12% respectively at the lower and upper ends of the age range.

In terms of ethnic background 91% of the elementary teachers are white compared to 76% of the secondary teachers. Three percent of elementary teachers are native american compared to 17% of secondary teachers. Three percent of elementary teachers are hispanic compared to 0% for secondary teachers. There aren't any teachers in the sample from asian or black backgrounds. (See Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Sample)

The results of the Staff Development Needs Assessment survey indicate that the greatest area of concern is in section I and II of the instrument. Specificially, these sections are concerned with student values and beliefs and specific skills demonstrated by students. In section I, which contains 9 questions concerned with student values and beliefs, 51% of the participants responded negatively indicating that their schools do not emphasize giving students opportunities to examine or explore their values or belief systems. Eighty-six percent of the participants indicated that their schools should emphasize this area. The largest discrepancy between what the school does emphasize and what the school should emphasize lies in the questions under this section. Secondary teachers reported the greatest concern in this area with 63% of the participants indicating that the schools do not emphasize this issue while 86% of secondary teachers reported that the schools should emphasize this area (See Table 2 Staff Development Needs Assessment Survey- Total Combined Responses).

TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE N=85

			ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	OTHER
I.	TEACHING LEVEL	N=	34	46	05

			A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
			1-5 YEARS			6-10 YEARS			11-15 YEARS			16-20 YEARS			21+ YEARS		
II.	YEARS TEACHING	N=	07	05	14	05	13	20	07	09	17	09	09	18	06	10	16
		%=	21	11	16	15	28	24	21	20	20	26	20	21	18	22	19

			A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
			20-30			31-40			41-50			51-60			60+		
III.	AGE	N=	05	06	12	14	17	33	11	15	29	04	06	10	0	0	0
		%=	15	13	14	41	37	39	32	33	34	12	13	12	0	0	0

			A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
			HISPANIC			NATIVE AMERICAN			WHITE			OTHER		
IV.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	N=	01	0	02	01	08	09	31	35	70	0	01	01
		%=	03	0	02	03	17	11	91	76	82	0	02	01

			A	B	C	A	B	C
			MALE			FEMALE		
V.	SEX	N=	08	24	33	25	21	50
		%=	24	52	39	74	46	59

NOTE: A= ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
B= MIDDLE SCHOOL AND HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS
C= OTHER (SPECIAL EDUCATION, MUSIC, ART, READING, ETC.)

TABLE 2: STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY (Total Combined Responses)

	CURRENT (Respondents perceptions of what is)		FUTURE (Respondents perceptions of what should be)		
	(A) NEGATIVE	(B) POSITIVE	(C) NEGATIVE (LESS)	(D) POSITIVE (JUST RIGHT)	(E) (MORE)
ELEMENTARY (%)					
I.	40	58	10	86	X
II.	41	56	08	90	X
III.	12	88	0.9	63	34
IV.	08	89	0	63	31
V.	27	64	04	87	X
VI.	28	71	03	93	X
SECONDARY (%)					
I.	63	36	11	86	X
II.	50	50	10	94	X
III.	13	81	01	57	41
IV.	22	71	01	62	29
V.	35	65	10	90	X
VI.	37	63	02	98	X
TOTAL (%)					
I.	51	49	09	86	X
II.	44	55	08	88	X
III.	14	83	0.8	58	41
IV.	14	77	0.6	63	29
V.	34	53	06	88	X
VI.	33	67	02	96	X

Another area of concern lies in the 15 questions in section II which is concerned with specific student skills. Forty-four percent of the participants responded negatively that in their school students do not currently demonstrate the identified skills. Eighty-eight percent of the participants also indicated that their students should demonstrate the identified skills. There do not appear to be major differences between elementary and secondary teachers in their responses to this section.

With respect to the 15 questions in section III which are concerned with the teacher's ability to assist students in the acquisition of specific skills, 83% of the participants responded positively that they are now doing an average to above average job. In response to where they want to be, 58% indicated that they are doing about right with respect to this issue and 41% indicated that they need to do more. There were no major differences between elementary and secondary teachers in their response patterns to this section of the survey.

Section IV is concerned with a teacher's own skill in working with children with handicapping conditions. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were positive with where they perceived they are now in working with these children. Only 14% of the total perceived their own skill in a negative manner. Sixty-three percent were satisified that they were doing about right and 29% felt that they needed to do more. Less than 1% felt that they needed to do less. There were differences between elementary and secondary teachers in terms of where they currently perceived themselves with respect to their own skills to assist children with handicapping conditions. Twenty-two percent of secondary teachers reported negative responses in terms of their current skills to assist these children, whereas, only 8% of elementary teachers reported negative responses. Eighty-eight percent of elementary teachers reported positive responses as compared to 71% for secondary teachers.

Section V is concerned with 12 questions which consider a variety of topics ranging from vocational preparation of students to curricula issues to staff development programs and school climate. Participant responses were generally more positive than negative, 53% vs. 34% respectively. Eighty-eight percent of respondents indicated that more rather than less emphasis should be placed in this area. There were no differences between the response patterns of elementary and secondary teachers in this section.

The final section VI of the survey was concerned with the level of support provided to teachers by school administration in a variety of areas. Sixty-seven percent of the participants responded that their school does provide them with support, whereas, 33% indicated the converse. Ninety-six percent indicated that their school should provide them with support. Secondary teachers were more negative in their responses than were elementary teachers. Thirty-seven percent of secondary teachers indicated that their schools do not provide them with support, whereas, 28 percent of elementary teachers indicated that their schools do not provide them with support.

A further inspection of the six areas in the survey indicated that of the nine questions in area one, only items 5 and 8 received a postive response from respondents in terms of what their school currently does emphasize. The remainder of the seven items received negative responses indicating that at least fifty percent of the respondents felt that their schools currently do not emphasize those particular skills. The responses were positive to students having the opportunity of understand the culture of others and to develop skills in problem solving and decision making.

An analysis of area two, which concerns the emphasis that schools place in its students' acquiring a set of generic academically related skills, questions 6 and 15 received a negative response. This indicated that little or no emphasis is placed by the schools in students' development of career awareness

skills or time management skills. Area three, which is concerned with teachers' perceptions of their own skills to assist students in the acquisition of the skills in area two, contained two questions with negative response patterns. Responses to items 8 and 10 indicated that teachers expressed negative feelings about their ability to assist students in the acquisition of career/vocational development skills and in the acquisition of computer literacy skills.

An analysis of area five indicated that questions 2, 7, and 11 contained fifty percent or more negative responses. Results indicate that teachers felt that currently students are not prepared to assume jobs in urban/suburban communities, that the curriculum is not consistent across grade levels, and that the districts do not provide staff development programs.

An analysis of area six, which is concerned with administrative support for teachers, indicated a negative response pattern for questions 5, 6, and 8, indicating that teachers perceive themselves as not having the opportunity to share their concerns and ideas in a constructive manner with district administrators and school board, as not receiving constructive feedback on their performance from administrators, and as not being viewed as professionals who make important contributions to the goals and activities of the school district.

DISCUSSION

In reviewing the results of an analysis of the data from the Needs Assessment instrument the pervasive negative response from the respondents to area one suggests the need for rural districts to place a greater emphasis on assisting its students to understand their values and improve their understanding and sensitivity toward others. This is consistent with the expectation that more and more rural students will be pursuing training and employment outside of the small communities in which they were raised. As these students relocate into urban and suburban communities they will need to increase their understanding of a more pluralistic society. The findings in area one are consistent with the finding in area 5 which indicates that teachers believe that rural schools are not sufficiently preparing graduates to assume jobs in urban and suburban settings.

In area two of the survey respondents felt that students in the participating rural districts needed to acquire career awareness and time management skills. Teachers responded positively in terms of their ability to deliver time management skills, but responded negatively in terms of their ability to provide students with career/vocational skills. It would appear as if districts may wish to consider whether this is an area which should be considered for staff development emphasis.

Area 4 which considered teachers ability to support and provide services to children with handicapping conditions in the mainstream resulted in highly positive teacher responses. We did not expect this high a level of positive response in this area, particularly from secondary level teachers who often resist the placement of mainstreamed handicapped children into the content areas. In discussing this finding with the administration and staff in the participating districts we discovered that extensive in-service education

programs concerned with handicapped education had been provided to teachers over the past several years. We suggested that this is an area which may need to be monitored because a number of teachers and administrators had privately expressed the concern that they had been saturated with mandates for preparing teachers to work with mainstreamed handicapped children. We perceived a negative underlying tone with respect to these related issues and suggest that this finding needs to be examined further, particularly through the administration of structured interviews with specific teachers, administrators and staff.

The negative response to specific items in area 6 indicates a need for school administrators to address needed support for improving the organizational climate of rural schools. It would appear that teachers do not feel that administration and school board members are easily accessible in terms of communication and that they do not receive adequate feedback from these individuals. The major implication here would be for a staff development program, on a district-wide basis, to address interpersonal and communication skills. Three of the participating districts confirmed the need for such a program and one district actually implemented a district-wide program in the beginning of the school year over a period of several weeks. Leaders from the business community were invited to conduct sessions with school personnel to improve organizational climate. Successful approaches from business and industry were applied to the school setting. Initial assessment by the school administration has indicated a positive response to this process.

The major implication from this research supports the research findings which suggest that productive staff development programs should be collaborative in nature. In addition, needs assessment has an integral role in the planning for successful staff development and in-service programs in rural settings.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. DIRECTIONS: Listed below are some of the skills and values which have been identified as being appropriate for students in rural school settings. Indicate how much emphasis you think your school DOES PLACE in the first column and SHOULD PLACE in the second column for each item by circling the appropriate number.

In my school, students have opportunities to:	SCHOOL DOES EMPHASIZE				SCHOOL SHOULD EMPHASIZE			
	Almost None	A Little	Quite A Bit	Great Deal	Almost None	A Little	Quite A Bit	Great Deal
1. Identify their values and beliefs.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Understand their values and beliefs.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Develop respect for the dignity of each person regardless of sex, race, religion or socioeconomic background.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Maintain their own cultural identity.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Understand the culture of others.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Develop respect for the values of people from different cultures/settings	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Be individually self-directed.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Develop skills in problem solving and decision making.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Learn interaction skills, such as attending, observing, listening, and group behavior skills and how they affect learning.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

II. DIRECTIONS: Listed below are skills which have been identified as being appropriate for students in rural school settings. Indicate how much emphasis you think your school DOES PLACE in the first column and SHOULD PLACE in the second column for each item by circling the appropriate number.

In my school, students demonstrate behavior to:	CURRENTLY				SHOULD			
	Almost None	A Little	Quite A Bit	Great Deal	Almost None	A Little	Quite A Bit	Great Deal
1. Acquire/apply appropriate oral communication skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Acquire/apply appropriate written language skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Develop quantitative skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Develop analytical skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Develop appropriate social/interpersonal skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Develop career awareness skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Develop occupational preparation skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Develop pre-vocational skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Develop computer literacy skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
10. Develop methods of scientific inquiry.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
11. Develop an understanding/awareness of the fine arts.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
12. Develop motor coordination/skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
13. Develop an awareness of leisure and leisure activities.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
14. Develop appropriate study skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
15. Develop time-management skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

III. DIRECTIONS: Circle the appropriate numeral to show your perception of your OWN skills to:

	WHERE I AM NOW				WHERE I WANT TO BE		
	Not At All Well	Poorly	Average	Very Well	Need to Do less	Doing About Right	Need to Do More
1. Assist students in understanding their values/beliefs/cultural identity.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
2. Assist students in understanding and respecting others.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
3. Assist students to be self-directed, to problem solve and to make decisions.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
4. Assist students to learn social interaction skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
5. Assist students to acquire language-related skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
6. Assist students to acquire quantitative skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
7. Assist students to acquire analytical skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
8. Assist students in career/vocational development.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
9. Assist students in developing study skills and time management skills.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
10. Help students to acquire computer literacy.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
11. Help students to deal with their own stress.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
12. Objectively evaluate student performance.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
13. Modify curriculum to be relevant to student needs and interests.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
14. Individualize instruction to meet learner needs.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

IV. DIRECTIONS: Circle the appropriate numeral to show your perception of your OWN skills to:

	WHERE I AM NOW				WHERE I WANT TO BE		
	Not At All Well	Poorly	Average	Very Well	Need to Do Less	Doing About Right	Need to Do More
1. Understand the nature of children with handicapping conditions.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
2. Assist my students in understanding the nature of handicaps.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
3. Accept into my classroom children with handicapping conditions.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
4. Assist my students to accept children with handicapping conditions.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
5. Individualize instruction in order for mainstreamed children to learn.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
6. Include mainstreamed children into classroom activities.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
7. Facilitate interaction between mainstreamed children and other children in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
8. Use teaching strategies that facilitate learning in mainstreamed children.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
9. Evaluate the performance of mainstreamed children in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
10. Interpret students' I.E.P.'s (Individualized Education Plans)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
11. Use IEP's in planning activities for mainstreamed children in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

V. DIRECTIONS: Please circle the numeral that indicates the degree to which the following statements apply to your district:

	THE WAY IT IS NOW				THE WAY IT SHOULD BE			
	Almost Never	A Little	Quite A Bit	Great Deal	Almost Never	A Little	Quite A Bit	Great Deal
1. Students are well-prepared to assume jobs in their home communities.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Students are well-prepared to assume jobs in urban/suburban communities.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Students are motivated to pursue post-secondary vocational training.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Students are motivated to pursue post-secondary college programs.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Students are readily admitted to post-secondary vocational training programs.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Students are readily admitted to college.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Our curriculum is consistent across grade levels.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Our curriculum is relevant for the above average student.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9. Our curriculum is relevant for the average student.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
10. Our curriculum is relevant for the below average, less motivated, and or handicapped student.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
11. Our district provides staff development programs.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
12. Our district provides a climate which supports staff growth and development.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

VI. DIRECTIONS: Listed below are areas which affect teachers in the school. Indicate how much support your school provides in the first column and how much support your school should provide in the second column by circling the appropriate number. (School refers to the support provided by building administrators, district administrators, and the school board)

In my school, I:	SCHOOL DOES SUPPORT				SCHOOL SHOULD SUPPORT			
	*N	S	M	E	N	S	M	E
1. Have the opportunity to discuss students' needs with other teachers, e.g., other grade level teachers, resource room teachers, guidance counselor, special area teachers (art, music, physical education, etc.)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2. Have the opportunity to work cooperatively with other teachers and staff in instructional planning and implementation.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Have the opportunity to share my concerns and ideas in a constructive manner with co-workers.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4. Have the opportunity to share my concerns and ideas in a constructive manner with my principal and can expect to receive feedback.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5. Have the opportunity to share my concerns and ideas in a constructive manner with district administrators and the school board and can expect to receive feedback from them.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6. Receive constructive feedback on my performance from administrators.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7. Am given opportunities to experience professional growth and development.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8. Am viewed as a professional who makes an important contribution to the goals and activities of this school and the school district.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

*N=Never
S=Slightly
M=Moderately
E=Extensively

School District Name _____

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DIRECTIONS: Circle the appropriate numeral for each category.

A. LEVEL OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. Elementary
2. Middle School
3. Secondary
4. Special Education
5. Combination Elm. & H.S.
6. Combination M.S. & H.S.
7. Other

B. TOTAL YEARS YOU HAVE TAUGHT INCLUDING THIS YEAR: 1 2 3 4 5

1. 1-5 years 2. 6-10 years 3. 11-15 years 4. 16-20 years 5. 21 years or more

C. MY PRIMARY ASSIGNMENT IS: (Please circle only one) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

0. All subjects (Elm., Spec. Ed., M.S.)
1. English, Reading, Lang. Arts
2. Math
3. Sciences
4. Industrial Arts, Home Ec.
5. Business
6. Fine Arts
7. P.E., Health
8. Foreign Languages
9. Other (specify)_____

D. WHAT IS YOUR AGE? 1 2 3 4 5

1. 20-30 years 2. 31-40 years 3. 41-50 years 4. 51-60 years 5. Over 60 years

E. WHAT IS YOUR ETHNIC ORIGIN? 1 2 3 4 5 6

1. Asian 2. Black 3. Hispanic 4. Native American 5. White 6. Other (specify)_____

F. SEX: 1 2

1. Male 2. Female

DIRECTIONS: List in priority order topics for which your district should provide staff development programs:

REFERENCES

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal programs supporting educational change. Vol. VIII. Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1978. ED 159-289.

Browder, D. Guidelines for inservice planning. Exceptional Children, January, 1983, 49 (3), 300-306.

Crealock, C. The W-6 model of needs assessment for inservice training. Special Education in Canada, Spring, 1982, 56 (3), 27-28.

Cruickshank et al. What we think we know about inservice education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 27-31.

Guenther, J. and Weible, T. Preparing teachers for rural schools. Rural Education, Winter, 1983, 1 (2), 59-61.

Helge, D.I. Models for serving rural students with low-incidence handicapping conditions. Exceptional Children, January, 1984, 313-324.

Helge, D.I. The state of the art of rural special education. Exceptional Children, January, 1984, 294-305.

Helge, D.I. and Marrs, L.W. Personnel recruitment and retention in rural america: A growing problem. The Pointer, Winter, 1982, 26 (2), 28-33.

Helge, D.I. Individualizing staff development in rural school districts to enhance services for all children, including the handicapped. National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project, January, 1981, 1-16.

Lawrence, G. Patterns of effective inservice education: A state of the art summary on materials and procedures for changing teacher behaviors in inservice education. Tallahassee, Florida State Department of Education, 1974. ED 176-424.

Meier, E. and Edington, E. Research synthesis: Teacher preparation for rural schools. Research in Rural Education, Spring, 1983, 2 (1), 3-8.

Nowak et al. Training educators to design, develop, and deliver in-service education. Exceptional Education Quarterly, November, 1982, 9-15.

Powers, D.A. Mainstreaming and the inservice education of teachers. Exceptional Children, February, 1983, 49 (5), 432-439.

Schmidt, G. Developing effective staff development programs in rural school systems. Small School Forum, Fall, 1983, 5 (1), 15-16.

Siantz, J. Inservice programming and preservice priorities. In J. Smith (Ed.), Personnel preparation and public law 94-142: The map, the mission and the mandate. Boothwyn, Penn: Educational Resource Center, 1978.

Skrtic, T.M. et al. Action vs. reaction: A curriculum development approach to inservice education. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1979, 11 (1), 1-16.